ENGLISH EDUCATION ACT OF 1918
THE FISHER BILL[1]

I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND FORECAST OF THE BILL

"*LASTLY*,—or rather firstly, and as the preliminary of all,—would there not be a Minister of Education? Minister charged to get this English People taught a little, at his and our peril! Minister of Education; no longer dolefully embayed amid the wreck of moribund 'religions,' but clear ahead of all that; steering free and piously fearless, towards *his* divine goal under the eternal stars!—O Heaven, and are these things forever impossible, then? Not a whit. To-morrow morning they might all begin to be, and go on through blessed centuries realizing themselves, if it were not that—alas, if it were not that we are most of us insincere persons, sham talking-machines and hollow windy fools! Which it is *not* 'impossible' that we should cease to be, I hope?"

Thus complained and counseled Thomas Carlyle in his "New Downing Street" Latter-Day Pamphlet of 1850. Many of the accompanying recommendations to his countrymen could hardly be given serious consideration, and in these more immediate latter days his voice may no longer carry far; but when he called for a "Minister of Education" he was anticipating a future call of the "immeasurable Democracy," whose "rising everywhere monstrous, loud, blatant, inarticulate as the voice of Chaos," he himself had in an earlier pamphlet so loudly and articulately deplored.

Eighteen years later, in 1868, Matthew Arnold proposed a revolutionary scheme for public education in England, placing "at the apex of the pyramid a Minister of Education." And again eighteen years later, when he had retired from his inspectorship of schools, he returned to this subject on addressing a gathering of teachers at Westminster in 1886, saying, "I know the Duke of Richmond told the House of Lords that, as Lord

[1] This article has been prepared for use in connection with the Rice Institute conferences on education and reconstruction, to be held during the visit of the British Educational Mission; and especially for the convenience of the school and college men and women of Texas and the surrounding States, all of whom are being invited to participate in the conferences.

President, he was Minister of Education [Laughter]; but really the Duke of Richmond's sense of humor must have been slumbering when he told the House of Lords that. A man is not Minister of Education by taking the name, but by doing the functions. [Cheers.] To do the functions he must put his mind to the subject of education; and so long as Lord Presidents are what they are, and education is what it is, a Lord President will not be a man who puts his mind to the subject of education. A Vice-President[1] is not, on the Lord President's own showing, and cannot be, Minister for Education. He cannot be made responsible for faults and neglects. Now what we want in a Minister for Education is this—a centre where we can fix responsibility."

It was only in 1916 that Carlyle's counsel of 1850 was fully heeded and Arnold's aspiration of 1868 finally realized by the appointment for the first time of an experienced educational administrator of high standing in scholarship to the presidency of the Board of Education.[2] The appointment of Mr. H. A. L. Fisher was hailed by scholars and statesmen alike. For his education the new Cabinet minister had studied at Winchester, at New College, Oxford, and in Paris and Göttingen. Moreover, to his credit as an undergraduate honors student he had a First Class in Classical Moderations and a First Class in Literæ Humaniores. He had become Fellow and Tutor of his college. He had been an inspiring teacher. His published works in mediæval and modern history had won for him an early election as Fellow of the British Academy. Humanist and historian of Oxford, he had been made Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sheffield, one of the newer universities of pure and applied science. He had been signally successful as an administrator. His abilities had received still further recognition through opportunities for service on several royal commissions. Accordingly, his advent to the new office of Minister of Education was acclaimed not only in England and Wales, but also from the outposts of the British Empire. And, despite the mutterings of "Musings without Method" and the like-minded, his

[1] The office of vice-president of the Committee of Privy Council on Education was created in 1856 by the first statute on public elementary education in England, but the Lord President of the Council was still theoretically president of the committee, and thus there was confusion between authority and responsibility.

[2] By the Board of Education Parliamentary Act of 1899 the office of vice-president of the council was abolished, and the Department of Science and Art was united with the Education Department in one central office under the title of the Board of Education, with a president and parliamentary secretary. Mr. Fisher's predecessors in the office of president were selected, it has been said, on the theory of English government that any man of ability is capable of taking any office without training or preparation, that the all-round man if given opportunity will fit himself to the squarest of holes, or as Sydney Smith put it, Lord John Russell was ready to take command of the Channel fleet at a moment's notice.

notable achievements in actual during-the-war reconstruction for England after the war have been equally acclaimed both within and without the United Kingdom.

In one of his speeches delivered on a tour designed to arouse his country to the importance of education, Mr. Fisher places his view of public education on a high plane of purpose and understanding in the following unmistakable terms: "The province of popular education is to equip the men and women of this country for the tasks of citizenship. All are called upon to live, many are called upon to die, for the community of which they form a part. That they should be rescued from the dumb helplessness of ignorance is, if not a precept of the eternal conscience, at least an elementary part of political prudence, to which the prospective enfranchisement of several million new voters, male and female, adds a new emphasis. But the argument does not rest upon grounds of political prudence only; but upon the right of human beings to be considered as ends in themselves and be entitled, so far as our imperfect social arrangements may permit, to know and to enjoy all the best that life can offer in the sphere of knowledge, emotion, and hope."

Similar views were being reflected from more than one quarter of Great Britain. For example, the same principles which sustain Mr. Fisher's view are emphasized in an unsigned article on "The Education of the Citizen" in the *Round Table* for June, 1917. "The education which has come in the wake of modern industrialism, if valued in terms of individual character and social well-being and security," says this illuminating anonymous writer, "is a disastrous failure. It is narrow in range and wrong in kind. It is not ruled by 'the handsome passions' and the wisdom which it seeks is not high. It does not secure happiness nor promote virtue. Too often it distorts as well as starves the souls of men. 'The fundamental truth in modern life, as I analyze it,' says President Wilson, 'is a profound ignorance. I am not one of those who challenge the promoters of special interests on the ground that they are malevolent, that they are bad men; I challenge their leadership on the ground that they are ignorant men, that when you have absorbed yourself in a business through half your life, you have no other point of view than the point of view of that business, and that, therefore, you are disqualified by ignorance from giving counsel as to common interests. . . . If you immerse a man in a given undertaking, no matter how big that undertaking is, and keep him immersed for half a lifetime, you can't expect him to see any horizon; you can't get him to see life steadily or see it whole.' "

"There is no solution of these difficulties," continues the philosopher in the *Round Table* article, "except by a change of national temper, and

there is no way of bringing that change about except by rescuing it from the clutches of industrialism. We must have a purpose. We must revert to the principal and main purpose which, in the British homes and in the schools, has fashioned young lives whose mettle has been tried hard by their country in this time of need, and has not been found wanting. And we must make it clear, hold it consciously, and carry it out resolutely.

"The essence of that purpose is that in all stages of education, from the lowest to the highest, the individual himself shall be the *sole end of the process,* and that ulterior considerations should have no more place in our schemes than they have in the mind of the mother when she suckles the infant at her breast. There is only one kind of school which gains a sensible man's entire trust—it is that in which the lessons, the games, the societies, the whole training, whether vocational or other, is meant to terminate and reach its final goal in the boys and girls themselves. The child is taught for his own sake, not in order that he may 'promote the efficiency of the State'—that is the German conception; nor for the sake of industrial efficiency—that is the conception of men tempted to regard the children of the workers as industrial pabulum."

In England, as in other countries, the fight for the child has been a fight with the family and the factory. It has been a fight for the custody of the child. It has been a fight for citizenship for the child. It has been a fierce fight for freedom, waged against forces[1] loosed by the Industrial Revolution. The Factory Acts[2] in England have been the forerunners

[1] In no language is there a more sensational literature than that provided by the blue books on the children of England, bearing reports of commissions, notably that of 1817 on chimney sweeps, those of 1842–43 on child labor in mines and manufactures, and that of 1867 on the abuse of children in agricultural gangs. These commissions found that little children in immense numbers had been actually drafted into mine and factory and field. In the mines, the age at which employment commenced was usually eight or nine, and frequently six and seven, the children working as a rule for twelve hours a day, with night work for the infants as a part of the ordinary routine. Underground, girls and boys, young men and young women, and married women, worked mingled together, commonly almost naked and in the grossest degradation. Similarly, in many of the manufactures, for example, in calico-printing, children of five or six ordinarily kept at work for fourteen hours; in the lace business children beginning work at five or six, and called up to work at all hours of the night; and in the millinery business of the metropolis conditions even more astounding. See George Peel, "The Future of England." London, Macmillan, 1911.

[2] Beginning with the First Factory Act, Sir Robert Peel's, in 1802, over one hundred public statutes have been passed in England dealing mercifully with children. These statutes have established, among many other things, the child's legal rights to conditions most essential to its life, and have made ill-treatment and neglect legal offences. The child may now receive the necessaries of life not merely by act of parental grace but by virtue of lawful claim; nor in the privileges of its citizenship may it ever again be regarded as property owned by the parent.

of progress in popular education. The fight for the individual has been a fight with industrialism. The other great difficulty has been not economic but religious; and so real, that the problem of public education in England has been virtually a religious problem, bill upon bill failing of passing, and act after act failing of its purpose, because of conflicts between the teachings of the Established Church and those of Nonconformity concerning the salvation of children's souls. These and similar conflicts between state and voluntary efforts for promoting popular education may have checked progress in public education, but in the long run they have contributed, and perhaps as advantageously as any other course, to the constitution of a national system sufficiently comprehensive to encourage education through private and philanthropic channels quite as much as by grants from the public chest.

It may now be inquired what machinery of public education is available, to be scrapped or improved by the new minister of education, for promoting his conception of the mission of education on the part of the state, promoting not primarily the welfare of institutions, nor primarily the welfare of industry, but primarily the welfare of "the individual himself as the sole end of the process," passing on to him as potential man, worker and citizen, a maximum measure of our common inheritance of "knowledge, emotion and hope." State education in England began much later and has progressed more slowly than in the United States.[1] As observed by Sir Joshua Fitch in the tenth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* "the public provision for the education of the people in England is not the product of any theory or plan formulated beforehand by statesmen or philosophers; it has come into existence through a long course of experiments, compromises, traditions, successes, failures and religious controversies. What has been done in this department of public policy is the resultant of many diverse forces and of slow evolution and growth rather than of pure purpose and well-defined national aims. It has been effected in different degrees by philanthropy, by private enter-

[1] As a matter of fact, the history of state education in England begins only in 1833, with a grant from the treasury of about £20,000 in aid of elementary schools. Up to 1832 the state recognized no national responsibility and incurred no expense for the elementary education of the people of England; nor did it impose upon parents any legal obligation to provide for the education of their children. (See the Harvard lectures of A. V. Dicey on "Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century," second edition. London, Macmillan, 1914.) On the other hand, in Massachusetts, when but a colony of twenty thousand people, living in thirty towns, there were passed as early as 1642 and 1647 legislative acts not only founding the Massachusetts school system, but also furnishing the type of future school legislation throughout the United States, and foreshadowing in principle the whole American system of education, including elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges.

prise, by religious zeal, by ancient universities and endowed foundations, by municipal and local effort, and only to a small extent by legislation. The genius—or rather characteristic habit—of the English people is averse from the philosophical system, and is disposed to regard education, not as a science, but as a body of expedients to be discovered empirically and amended from time to time as occasion may require." And similarly, Mr. (now Sir Graham) Balfour, describing the generating currents of the four systems of national education that are virtually existing side by side in the United Kingdom, says: "We can see England, businesslike and unphilosophical, somewhat lethargic in her prosperity, slowly realizing first the commercial advantages of education and then the possibility of applying scientific methods to the process: great in self-government, yet delegating to the localities only those powers which she intends them to use; making a working compromise at every step, and triumphantly disregarding consistency in details: strong in her sense of duty, greatly proud of her ancient institutions, liberal in grants once her hand is opened. There are Wales and Scotland to whom education is far more dear: Wales, in a newly born fervor for knowledge, producing, as it were by magic, order out of chaos; Scotland, thrifty, prosperous and wise; with an ecclesiastical history 'the most perverse and melancholy in man's annals,' yet without a religious difficulty in her schools;[1] having taught her children for centuries past to mind their book and get on in the world, and to be independent and upright—a lesson well learned at home and practised with great success abroad. Last comes Ireland, poor and in subjection; passionately attached to her faith; lovable and unreliable and helpless; a child among nations: the Celtic genius mysterious and unpractical, 'always bound nowhere under full sail,' abandoned for long to obsolete methods and inadequate instruction, because reform meant the calling up of many quarrels."[2] "Of these four," writes Sir Michael E. Sadler, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds, "the Scottish system is the most homogeneous, the Irish the most divided, the Welsh the most enthusiastic, the English the most complicated and various." And the same well-known authority has written as follows of the ideals of the last-

[1] Moreover, John Knox's advocacy of an elementary school for every parish, a grammar school for every market town and a university for every city, had secured for even the poorest scholar of ability in Scotland free access to the highest educational facilities possessed by the country.

[2] Graham Balfour, "The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland." Oxford, University Press, 1903.

In the face of the above quoted characterizations from Mr. Graham Balfour it perhaps should be remarked that in the period at the opening of the nineteenth century when England was at its lowest ebb in matters of education, the Irish were advancing and showed, as Sir Robert Peel declared, "the greatest eagerness and desire . . . for the benefits of instruction."

named system: "England stands half-way, as it were, between the American and the German ideals. She seeks to combine freedom and authority; experiment and tradition; modern studies and classical; interest and discipline; supervision from above and a large measure of local variety and self-government. She finds much to admire both in German education and in American. In the former, its extraordinary precision of aim, its high intellectual standards, its wide diffusion and convenience of access. In the latter, its verve, its belief in its own future, its intense vitality, its incessant experimenting, its courage and its readiness to take stock of itself and to adjust itself to new needs. They, on the other hand, find much to admire in our best educational tradition—in its fairness of mind; in its personal devotion to the welfare of the boys or girls committed to its charge; in its strong ethical tradition; in its conviction that, unless ballasted by a strong moral character, intellectual brilliancy is a mischievous thing; and, not least, in its belief that the highest kind of scholarship is that which translates into wise action and unselfishly embodies itself in the corporate life of some institution."[1]

The English system can be best understood through a historical study of its development.[2] Such historical studies are only slowly becoming available, and then at the hands of students of the history of education, for in the minds of most political historians education seems to be practically a negligible element. Green, in his "History of the English People," hardly touches the subject of education. And the same remark is applicable to almost every history of every epoch of England's life.[3] Now

[1] Michael E. Sadler, "American Ideals in Education," Special Reports, Vol. II.

[2] For the history of public education in England see "The Government of England," by A. Lawrence Lowell, ninth edition, New York, Macmillan, 1912; the *Cyclopædia of Education,* edited by Paul Monroe; the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* in particular the contribution of G. B. M. Coore to the article on "National Systems of Public Education"; and the file of the *Educational Review,* edited by Nicholas Murray Butler. For the current history of educational problems, the *London Times Educational Supplement,* now issued weekly, is invaluable; and the reviews of foreign educational progress in the Annual Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education are also familiar sources of information. In particular, for the denominational and undenominational arguments on the English education question see "Current Political Problems," by Sir J. D. Rees, London, Arnold, 1912; and for the conservative political argument see "The Province of the State," by Sir Roland K. Wilson, London, King, 1911, where such current phrases as "the level at which democracy will be safe," "save the democracy," and "the safe working of democracy" appear.

[3] For example, Louis Cazamian in his "Modern England: An historical and sociological study," pp. xi + 292, New York, Dutton, 1912, devotes to education a single paragraph of fewer than two hundred words. This paragraph is, to be sure, an admirable summary as far as it goes, and in the admirable setting to be expected from the pen of a distinguished French professor of English literature. On the other hand, Gilbert Slater, a former

the history of that long course of controversies and compromises, so characterized in the above quotation from Sir Joshua Fitch, falls conveniently into several periods. The first definite legislative success came in 1832–33, as has already been noted, in the wake of the great Reform Bill of 1832. The crest of the course appeared in the critical year of 1870, which witnessed in France the foundation of the Third Republic, in Germany the rise of the Empire, farther south the completion of Italian Unity, and in England the first education act establishing school boards and board schools under their supervision. And it has been through the gradual extension of general and compulsory provisions during the interval, including Forster's bill of 1870 and Balfour's bill of 1902, that there has been evolved the national system which Mr. Fisher's bill of 1918 would enlarge into a "University of England," so designated in public speech by the author of the bill, offering all the children of England opportunity for continuous education from the cradle through college. This evolution of a complete system adapted to the needs of the masses of the people in opposition to any class monopoly in education, has been accompanied by a modification of the original purposes of popular education in England, for in those original purposes there seems to have been more of charity to the poor than of cultivation for the people, more of aim towards the prevention of crime than of aid towards the promotion of knowledge among the people. It has been a long but no mean story, from the canons of 1604 which secured the control of education to the Established Church, on down to the relations established in 1918 between local and central government control.[1]

The first elementary schools were preparatory departments of the

principal of Ruskin College, Oxford, in his "Making of Modern England," pp. xii + 308 + xli, revised edition, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1915, writing from social and industrial rather than political standpoints, gives to public elementary education one of twenty-three chapters. The contents of this concise but somewhat colored record do not extend beyond the Education Acts of 1902 and 1903.

[1] The question of central or local authority has been one of the main issues in the parliamentary debates on Mr. Fisher's bill. It is also a sharp question in the present-day discussion of American educational problems. In a Yale lecture on the responsibilities of citizenship Simeon E. Baldwin expressed in 1912 the conservative view in the following terms:

"And now let us ask where rests the responsibility for marking out the lines of American education. Is it a divided or a centralized responsibility? Have we one or many authorities to which to look?

"The shaping of education is in the hands of the States, and there it must remain. The Bureau of Education at Washington may make and often does make helpful suggestions, but it can exercise no control, nor can any other officer or agency of the United States. The German principle of trusting the several States of the empire, not that adopted by Japan, of leaving all to the imperial government, is in harmony with American institutions. We believe that systems of education must be under home rule, and conform to

grammar schools. Of these grammar schools, mediæval in type, Winchester, founded in 1393, is the oldest. Stratford-on-Avon, refounded in 1553; St. Paul's, founded in 1509; and Grantham, refounded in 1553, are representative old grammar schools and typify the close connection of these schools with the best national life of England, as the schools to which William Shakespeare, John Milton, and Sir Isaac Newton went as schoolboys.[1] On the other hand, the first germ of state interference appeared in laws which required "children between five and thirteen years of age who were found begging or idle to be bound apprentices to some handicraft,"—the so-called apprenticeship laws of Henry VIII. And if plans promulgated in the illustrious reign of his daughter, characterized by a modern historian[2] as the golden age of English education, had persisted to the present day, the Great War, in the opinion of the same writer, would have found England in possession of a rigid state system with efficiency minus freedom; in any event, the collapse that followed the elaborate programme of the Elizabethans is comparable to that other retardation which came later in the wake of the reaction from the French Revolution. Under the patronage of Queen Mary, efforts were made at the end of the seventeenth century to enlarge the facilities for elementary education by the provision of charity schools, and the movement was organized by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge founded in 1699 by Thomas Bray. These schools usually provided the pupils with meals and clothing, teaching the boys reading, writing and a little arith-

local needs and capabilities. They cannot be identical in Massachusetts and Montana; in Charleston and Chicago.

"The demands for educational freedom are absolutely opposed to Federal direction of school affairs, and endangered by all grants of aid from the Federal treasury. The agricultural colleges of the country are now, to some extent, sources of peril to the autonomy of the States, in respect of their internal concerns. They familiarize the minds of the students with the idea of Federal dependence, and introduce an extraneous authority to determine policies of instruction and research.

"The education of Americans must be American in type. It must impress upon all who receive it our combination of local home rule in most things with supreme control at Washington over a few things. Each is equally necessary for the perpetuity of our institutions."—Simeon E. Baldwin, "The Relations of Education to Citizenship," New Haven, Yale University Press, 1912.

[1] See Foster Watson, "The Old Grammar Schools," New York, Putnam, 1916.

Under the Grammar Schools Act of 1840 a number of these English endowments were reorganized as higher elementary schools.

[2] Mr. J. E. G. de Montmorency, a frequent contributor on educational topics to the English monthly and quarterly reviews, and the author of "State Intervention in English Education: a short history from the earliest times down to 1833," Cambridge, University Press, 1902, and "The Progress of Education in England: a sketch of the development of English educational organization from early times to the year 1904," London, Knight, 1904.

metic, and the girls, in separate establishments, reading, writing and sewing; however, only a small proportion of the child population could be reached in this way, but towards the end of the eighteenth century a larger need began to be met by the Sunday Schools of the movement associated with the name of Robert Raikes. The opening of the nineteenth century found religious peace in England shattered, and the religious controversy in education precipitated by ideas for a national system of popular education upon a voluntary basis, ideas at which two strong men, Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster, had arrived independently. To supply the need of teachers, immediately demanded for the successful operation of such a system, each of these gentlemen proposed the monitorial method, which each of them claimed to have originated.[1] And to develop the voluntary school system under the monitorial plan there was formed in 1808 the non-sectarian British and Foreign School Society,[2] originally the Royal Lancasterian Society, and in 1809 the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales, with Bell as its superintendent. Such recourse to voluntary effort was made inevitable by the defeat of Samuel Whitbread's Poor Law Reform Bill of 1807, which included a great education scheme. This eminent Whig statesman had already in mind one hundred and ten years ago most of the present social problems of England: he desired to create state savings banks for the poor, to build cottages for the industrial classes out of the rates, to restrict outdoor relief to the sick, to the aged, and to the children. He proposed to make a new England. The time, he declared with eloquence, had come for a national system of education for the children of the poor, "because within a few years there has been discovered a plan," referring to the above-mentioned monitorial system, "for the instruction of youth which is now brought to a state of great perfection,

[1] In explanation of the system Dr. Bell insisted "that in order to establish a good school of nine hundred or one thousand children it would be sufficient to obtain some disused workshop or other building capable of accommodating the children, and the services of a man of good natural common sense, who would receive a month's training in the art and science of education. As soon as the master had been trained the school would be opened. From among the children in attendance some thirty of the most intelligent would be selected and would be admitted half an hour before the other children. In that half hour the master would teach them the lesson for the day, and then each of these thirty little monitors would be given a class of thirty other children, and would recite what he had just learned to his class, while the master surveyed the scene and maintained order."

It has been remarked that the monitorial system as thus advocated by Bell, and methods adopted more recently by Montessori, are essentially European importations of ideas formed in India.

[2] See the "Centenary History of the British and Foreign School Society, A Century of Education, 1808–1908," by H. B. Binns, London, Dent, 1908.

happily combining rules by which the object of learning must be infallibly attained with expedition and cheapness, and holding out the fairest prospect of eminent utility to mankind." Whitbread a little later divided his great scheme of social regeneration into four bills, one of which contained his plan for the education of the poor. Despite public approval, intense sympathy on the part of the House of Commons, and the removal of compulsory features, Whitbread's plan failed of passage, mainly because the conservative classes, frightened by the French Revolution and fearing its reënactment in England, viewed with alarm "any proposals to establish a system of universal education as likely to diffuse revolutionary ideas and to promote seditious propaganda." As a matter of fact, the bill was damned on second reading by Davies Giddy[1] (afterwards Gilbert), a scientist of distinction, who considered that the plan proposed would be "prejudicial to the morals and happiness of the people." It was not until 1820 that further effort towards legislation was made, but Brougham's bill of that year, when under full sail towards successful passage in the House of Commons, was mysteriously abandoned, presumably after unseen attack by the vested interests involved. The object was not to be attained for fifty years, but through forty-five of those years Brougham kept up the campaign for the education of the people, through pamphlets of many editions, and parliamentary speeches that have been characterized as "models of oratory, idealism and statistical compilation."

Of actual government steps towards state-aided public education, the first came in 1832, when the Whig government, on passing the Reform Bill, placed in the Estimates a grant of twenty thousand pounds, to be administered not by a special department but by the Treasury under conditions laid down by a minute of August 30th, 1833, and to be used solely for the erection of schools, with the proviso that no grant was to be made until at least one half of the cost of building had been met by voluntary contributions actually received, and then only on applications recommended by the National Society or the British and Foreign School

[1] Davies Giddy was later president of the Royal Society, a strong supporter of such men as Humphry Davy in their work of discovery, and promoter in Parliament of the claims of science and art. In his House of Commons speech against the Whitbread bill Giddy argued that "however specious in theory might be the project of giving education to the laboring classes of the poor, it would in effect be found to be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society had destined them; instead of teaching them subordination, it would render them factious and refractory; it would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors; and in a few years the result would be that the Legislature would find it necessary to direct the strong arm of power against them and to furnish the executive magistrate with much more vigorous laws than were now in force."

Society. There was provision for audit, but none for inspection. About this time, and three quarters of a century in advance of Mr. Fisher, to no avail Roebuck "demanded, in a really great speech, infant schools, evening schools, schools of industry, training schools, all provided in school districts controlled by education committees." No increase in grants was made until 1839, when Lord Melbourne's [1] government raised the annual vote to thirty thousand pounds, and created on the initiative of Lord John Russell an education office to do business under the style of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, though it was only by a majority of five in a House of five hundred and fifty-five members, against an opposition in which Gladstone, Disraeli and Peel united, that the appointment of this Committee of the Privy Council was sanctioned by the House of Commons, and the departure made that laid the basis of the present English system.[2] Among the first acts of the committee were those placing all buildings upon trusts permanently securing them to the education of poor children, requiring all buildings to conform to fixed standards of structural efficiency, and calling for the right of inspection in all cases. The methods of inspection were modified in 1846, and, following the adverse report of 1845 on the monitorial system, for the latter a system of pupil teachers was substituted, and the grants increased. From thirty thousand pounds in 1839, the annual grant had risen to nearly four hundred thousand in 1855, and by 1860 it was almost eight hundred and fifty thousand pounds; nor should such rise be surprising since, from 1843 on, grants had been made to training colleges, and from 1846 on, capitation grants in support of the pupil teacher training system, including provisions for retiring pensions to elementary teach-

[1] In a review of Ian Hay's "The Lighter Side of School Life," the Right Hon. George W. E. Russell, recalling the conservative opinions of these earlier days in the history of public education in England, quotes Lord Melbourne's complaint, "It is tiresome to hear education discussed, tiresome to educate, and tiresome to be educated," and further from Queen Victoria's Journal, "Lord M. made us laugh very much with his opinions about Schools and Public Education; the latter he don't like, and when I asked him if he did, he said, 'I daren't say in these times I'm against it, but I *am* against it.' He says it may do pretty well in Germany, but that the English would not submit to that thraldom; he thinks it had much better be left to Voluntary Education, and that people of very great genius were educated by circumstances, and that the 'education of circumstances' was the best; what *is* taught in schools might be improved, he thinks."

[2] This year, 1839, of significant events in English education, was also the year of the agreement signed by Great Britain, Belgium, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, guaranteeing the perpetual neutrality of Belgium, and the integrity and inviolability of her territory. Of the twenty-four articles of that agreement the seventh reads: "La Belgique, dans les limites indiquées aux Articles i, ii, et iv, formera un État indépendant et perpétuellement neutre. Elle sera ternue d'observer cette même neutralité envers tous les autres États."

ers, while in 1847 state aid was extended to Wesleyan and Roman Catholic schools, and in 1851 Jewish schools received recognition on condition that the Scriptures of the Old Testament should be daily read in them.

Though these years were witnessing rapid increase in the size and range of the annual grants, all attempts to secure by statute a national system of education had failed. After the abandoning of Lord Brougham's bill in 1820 no such further efforts were made for nearly a quarter of a century. It was with the educational clauses of Sir Robert Peel's Factory Bill of 1842 that attempts were renewed. They were continued unsuccessfully throughout the decade of 1847–57 by the introduction almost annually of three sets of bills, one set introduced on behalf of the government by Lord John Russell, a second promoted in the interests of the secular schools by the Lancashire and National Public Schools Associations, and a third advanced in aid of the voluntary schools by the Manchester and Salford Committee on Education. All these bills were swept away. Gladstone, Disraeli and Salisbury joined in the sweeping. There were strong undercurrents to assist them. There were strong undercurrents they could not resist. There were the interests of the manufacturers. Moreover, there were equally strong religious currents. They were moving, they thought, to prevent infidelity on the one hand and to preserve on the other the principle of voluntary exertion. They thought they were moving in the direction of civil and religious freedom. And the future does look back with just such astonishment as Macaulay predicted when in 1847 he appealed with confidence "to a future age which, while enjoying all the blessings of a just and efficient system of State education, will look back with astonishment to the opposition which the introduction of that system encountered and which will be still more astonished that such resistance was offered in the name of civil and religious freedom."

The year 1851 witnessed an international event of first-rate importance in the first International Exhibition held in Hyde Park. Under the influence of the Prince Consort—"who, when all is known," says Fabian Ware,[1] "will probably be found to have seen deeper into our educational needs than anyone else of his time"—the profits from this exhibition, amounting to £186,436, together with a parliamentary grant of £150,000, were devoted to the purchase of land in South Kensington, to be used, among other purposes, for the furthering of a scheme of "instruction for those engaged in the prosecution of arts and manufactures." To this end the Science and Art Department, created to control and organize in-

[1] Fabian Ware, "Educational Foundations of Trade and Industry," London and New York, Harper, 1901.

dustrial education, was formally established in 1853, and transferred in 1856 from the Board of Trade to the Committee of Council on Education. In the latter year a purely administrative bill was passed, instituting the office of vice-president of the committee, to which earlier reference has already been made in these notes. Moreover, during the 'fifties, still other distinct gains were made, for the lines on which Lord John Russell's unsuccessful bill of 1854 was framed were those subsequently adopted in 1870, and his bill of 1853 to permit the municipal boroughs to levy rates in aid of education, though failing of passage, created incidentally capitation grants—made available a little later for urban areas as well as rural—thereby extending to the maintenance of schools the principle of state assistance which had first been applied to the building of schools and then to the training of teachers. Furthermore, by Denison's Act, passed in 1855, the guardians of the poor were enabled to make grants for educational purposes to persons already in receipt of outdoor relief. But, as has already been remarked, progress of state-aided education during this decade is perhaps best measured by the increase from year to year in the annual parliamentary grant. A strong commission of inquiry into the disposition of these grants was appointed in 1858 on the motion of Sir John Pakington, an eminent conservative educationist, who was responsible for most of the denominational educational bills of this decade. "The one definite achievement of this commission[1] was the famous system of payment by results, which may be said to have excited a keener and more prolonged controversy than any other measure of a purely educational character." The plan received the designation "payment by results" because "except in the case of infants, where a capitation grant was to be made on attendance alone, a grant was to be awarded only for each child who passed before the inspector an examination in reading, writing, and arithmetic." In the Revised Code of 1862—the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education had been codified for the first time in 1860, and issued yearly thereafter—provision was made for the payment of grants upon the old principle and further grants upon the results of examination. Mr. Robert Lowe, vice-president of the Committee of Council from 1859–64, declared in the House of Commons of the system of payment by results that "if it was costly it should at least be efficient; and if it was inefficient it should at least be cheap." In fact, it proved to be cheap, the grant falling off £175,000 from 1861–65. Modifications introduced in 1867

[1] Under the chairmanship of the Duke of Newcastle, this commission was known as the Newcastle Commission. See Report on the State of Popular Education in England and the Measures required for the Extension of sound and cheap Elementary Instruction to all Classes of the People. *Com. Papers*, 1861, XXI, Part I.

failed to meet all objections, but the system was not finally abolished until 1904.

By the passage in 1867 of the second Reform Act, enfranchising all men householders in boroughs, the education problem was rendered all the more acute by the necessity of protecting a growing democracy from the perils of illiteracy. In this year and again in 1868, the Liberal statesmen, Bruce, Forster, and Egerton, introduced a bill which formed the basis of the measure of 1870. Shortly before 1870 two associations were organized to focus opinion in the country, one the Birmingham Education League, advocating free compulsory secular schools maintained by local authorities through local rates, and the other called the Manchester Education Union, formed to urge a universal plan based upon the existing system of voluntary schools. The Elementary Education Bill of 1870, introduced by Forster, "under the most powerful Liberal ministry of recent times," as initially a compromise between these two plans, was, during its passage through Parliament, still further modified to meet the rival claims.[1] The act required that there should be a public elementary school under state inspection available in every district, these several districts consisting of the several corporate boroughs of the country, individually, the separate parishes, individually, and what is now the County of London. If in any school district sufficient voluntary schools did not exist and were not formed, a school board had to be organized and required to build and maintain schools out of the rates. As to religious

[1] On the persisting bitterness engendered by the religious question in the Education Act of 1870, an interesting sidelight is thrown by Sir Edward Thorpe in his recent memoir of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe (London, Longmans, 1916). Commenting on the cordial reception accorded the author of the bill at the Inaugural Ceremony of the Yorkshire College of Science, October 6th, 1875, Sir Edward Thorpe says in effect that when in 1875 Mr. Gladstone suddenly threw up his position as leader of the Liberal party then in opposition, and public opinion designated Mr. Forster as one of the two or three politicians of eminence who might fitly be regarded as his successor, the unforgiving sectarian rancor, induced in some of Mr. Forster's political allies in the Education League by his action—or what they supposed to be his sole action—respecting the religious question, rewarded him "for the wise and statesmanlike measure of 1870—one of the finest achievements to the credit of the Liberal party," by rudely checking his natural ambitions as a statesman, through virtually compelling him to withdraw from the contest rather than divide the Liberal party, following a resolution hostile to his claims passed by the League party in his own constituency. "Extremists on both sides abused Forster," says Mr. Hugh Chisholm, editor of the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica,* "but the government had a difficult set of circumstances to deal with, and he acted like a prudent statesman in contenting himself with what he could get. An ideal bill was impracticable; it is to Forster's enduring credit that the bill of 1870, imperfect as it was, established at last some approach to a system of national education in England without running absolutely counter to the most cherished English ideas and without ignoring the principal agencies already in existence."

instruction, the bill required that such instruction must be given either at the beginning or at the end of the school period, thus allowing parents to withdraw their children if they chose, and further that "no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school." This last stipulation is known as the Cowper-Temple clause,[1] proposed by Mr. Cowper-Temple, and incorporated in the act during the debates. The school boards were to be elected directly by the voters, and, for the protection of the religious minorities, it was further stipulated that the election was to be by cumulative vote, that is to say, each elector could cast for a single candidate, or, distributed as he pleased, as many votes as there were places to be filled. The bill neither made education free nor compulsory, though it did to a limited extent enforce upon parents the obligation of providing their children with elementary knowledge and compelled the parents to share in the expense through the payment of school fees. In the Elementary Education Act of 1876 this duty on the parents received distinct legal recognition in the statute: "It shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and if such parent fail to perform such duty, he shall be liable to such orders and penalties as are provided by the Act." In 1880 the compulsory attendance of children at school was for the first time made universal, but it was not until 1891 that elementary education became free.

The arrangement by which elementary education became free was the first important piece of legislation following the reports of Lord Cross's Commission appointed in 1887 to inquire into the working of the education acts.[2] The campaign for free education, which had been brought within the range of practical politics by the adoption of universal compulsion under the Elementary Education Act of 1880, came logically also in the wake of the third Reform Act, 1885, enfranchising agricultural laborers, and was inaugurated by a small political group of pronounced collectivist tendencies. Mr. Dicey has remarked, in his Harvard lectures to which reference has already been made, that the gradual development of the conviction that the nation must provide for the education

[1] "That the religious teaching in the board schools under the Cowper-Temple clause, although entirely undenominational, is, as a rule, neither godless, radical, nor lacking in instruction in the Scriptures, any one may convince himself," says Mr. Lowell, "by looking at the return of the school programmes on the subject submitted by the Education Department to the House of Lords on June 13, 1906."

[2] See the report, issued in 1888, entitled Lord Cross's Commission on the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales, 1886. The labors of this commission produced elaborate reports, majority and minority, on the political, administrative, scholastic, and religious aspects of the education problem.

of the people, and make such provision at the expense of the nation, may be, and certainly has been in England, connected with the development of collectivism; but he also insists that "the mere fact that a country maintains a national system of education does not of itself necessarily prove the prevalence of socialistic ideas, as witness the history of popular education in Scotland and in New England." In this connection it may perhaps be stated that during the corresponding period of educational development in France, primary education was in 1881 made free in that country; in 1882, compulsory; in 1886, the state schools were secularized; and more recently, under the religious associations law almost all the voluntary primary schools were abolished. According to Friedrich Paulsen, the principle of compulsory school attendance was proclaimed for the first time in the School Regulations issued for Weimar in 1619. Moreover, compulsory education as a righteous demand on the part of the state was affirmed in the Massachusetts Acts of 1642 and 1647.[1]

State intervention in secondary education in England limped tardily on the heels of the first state aid to elementary education, for the first step in the way of such intervention was taken only in 1861 by the appointment of Lord Clarendon's commission of inquiry into the condition of the nine endowed schools. Following the report of this commission in 1864 the Public Schools Act of the same year introduced certain reforms in the administration of Eton, Winchester, Westminster, Charterhouse, Harrow, Rugby, and Shrewsbury, but left the two great London day schools, St. Paul's and Merchant Taylors, outside its operation. Further and much wider investigation on all the schools which had not been studied either by the Newcastle or the Clarendon Commission was instituted by Lord Taunton's Schools Inquiry Commission of 1864–68,[2] but

[1] The half dozen underlying principles of the Massachusetts Acts of 1842 and 1847 have been summarized by Martin in his "Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System" as follows: "The universal education of youth is essential to the well-being of the state. The obligation to furnish this education rests primarily upon the parent. The state has the right to enforce this obligation. The state may fix a standard which shall determine the kind of education and the minimum amount. Public money raised by general tax may be used to provide such education as the state requires, and the tax may be general though the school attendance is not. Education higher than the rudiments may be supplied by the state, and opportunity must be provided at the public expense for youths who wish to be fitted for college."

[2] Reading the history of public education in England through its tortuous course of royal commission preceding parliamentary act on education, child welfare, or industrial legislation, followed by royal commission, and so on indefinitely, one is struck by the eminence of the men who have served the state on these commissions of inquiry. For example, among those who participated in the deliberations of Lord Taunton's Commission were Lord Lyttelton, Dr. Frederick Temple (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury), Lord Stanley, Mr. William E. Forster, Dean William F. Hook, and Sir Stafford

the time was not ripe for translating into legislative action the recommendations of this commission for the general administrative organization of a system of secondary education, through the establishment of a central authority, local or provincial authorities, and a central council on education charged with examination duties, though results of far-reaching importance, based on the Taunton Reports, were embodied in the Endowed Schools Acts of 1869–74, reorganizing ancient endowments and reinterpreting all ancient trusts as free from denominational restrictions, exception being made of course in any case where conditions to the contrary had been imposed by or under the authority of the founder.

Thirty years after the first report of the Schools Inquiry Commission and twenty years after the last of the Endowed Schools Acts, the whole region of secondary education as distinct from elementary education was thoroughly canvassed by a royal commission appointed in 1894 under the presidency of Mr. James Bryce. The Bryce Commission was instructed "to consider what are the best methods of establishing a well-organized system of secondary education in England, taking into account existing deficiencies, and having regard to such local sources of revenue from endowment, or otherwise, as are available, or may be made available for this purpose, and to make recommendations accordingly." In their printed report, begun in 1895 and extending through ten volumes, the commissioners state that they have interpreted these instructions as confining their inquiries to the organization of secondary education, without including either an examination and description of the instruction actually given in secondary schools, or a consideration of what subjects such instruction ought to cover and by what methods it should be given. Before the Bryce survey was made, the development of secondary education had been further stimulated by the Technical Instruction Acts[1] of 1889 and 1891. These acts and the early grants of the Science and Art De-

Northcote, while among the assistant commissioners were Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. James (now Viscount) Bryce, Mr. (afterwards Sir Joshua) Fitch, and Dr. James Fraser.

[1] The *Record* of the National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education, published first monthly and later on quarterly through the twenty years, 1887–1907, of the association's existence, furnishes a very complete history of the development of technical and secondary education during this period. See also the report of 1884 of a royal commission "to inquire into the instruction of the industrial classes of certain foreign countries in technical and other subjects, for the purpose of comparison with that of the corresponding classes in this country; and into the influence of such instruction on manufacturing and other industries at home and abroad." The president of this commission was the Right Hon. Sir Bernhard Samuelson, and among its members were the Right Hon. Sir Henry Roscoe and Sir Philip Magnus.

partment were forces tending toward the promotion of a national system of secondary education in which the mathematical and physical sciences and the modern languages should predominate, not to the exclusion of the older literary studies but with the inclusion of technical and scientific instruction as necessary and integral parts. Similar stimulating formative influences were at work through the new university colleges[1] that were springing up in the manufacturing centres of the country; through the growing interest in wider provision for the liberal education of women; through the more general recognition of the need for the professional training of teachers; and through the increasing demands on the school boards to extend their courses beyond the limits of elementary teaching,[2] calling also for a thoroughgoing organization of public education in respect of its elementary, secondary, and technological branches. On passing all these phenomena in review, the members of the Bryce Commission found that "the problem which the facts suggested was more easily stated

[1] It was with the rise of these provincial universities and university colleges, intended to educate the masses of the people, that for the first time appropriations from the public chest came to the aid of university education in England. Such state aid from the National Government dates from 1889–90, and takes the form of annual grants administered by the Treasury, awarded for the promotion of teaching and research of university standard, and only to such institutions as satisfy severe qualifying tests. Moreover, under the provision in the Act of 1902 for assistance to any education not elementary, these same institutions receive grants from the local authorities of the areas in which they are situated and from neighboring counties and boroughs whose people profit by their instruction. While each of these forms of university grants varies widely in amount, the national grants have been as much as thirty per cent. and the local grants fifteen per cent. of the institutions' total income.

The university college grants include liberal items for the training of teachers. Moreover, the residential college normal schools of the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society have been since 1843 subsidized by training college grants. In this connection it may be mentioned that Cambridge instituted in 1879 examinations for a teacher's diploma. More recently, with the municipalization of education, local education authorities have aided the establishment of teacher training colleges by grants raised in 1906 from twenty-five to seventy-five per cent. of the capital expenditure.

[2] By the Education Act of 1870 establishing school boards for the first time, these boards were authorized to maintain only elementary schools. Accordingly in allowing grants for classes beyond the elementary range, their legal authority had been exceeded. The illegality of their procedure in these respects was established in 1901 by the famous judgment by the Court of Appeal in the test case of Rex *versus* Cockerton, following the refusal of Mr. Cockerton, an auditor of the Local Government Board, to allow certain payments which had been made in London for higher grade elementary instruction. Thereupon, however, the government immediately passed a brief measure sanctioning the continuance of the work of the higher grade elementary schools and of the evening continuation classes on the old basis for a year, and made this sanction permanent in the Education Act of 1902.

than solved; it was, in a few words, how to provide a single central authority which should supervise the interests of secondary education in England as a whole; to provide local authorities representative in the most complete sense, which should in their respective areas regard those interests with a similarly comprehensive view; and, reserving a large freedom for such local authorities, to reconcile the ultimate unity of central control with a system sufficiently elastic to meet the almost infinite variety of local requirements." Accordingly their principal practical recommendations were, first, on the side of central authority, the unification of the existing central authorities,—namely, the Charity Commission, in its educational capacity, the Science and Art Department at South Kensington, and the Education Department at Whitehall,—in one central department, and the establishment of an Educational Council analogous in some of its functions to the Board of Admiralty and in others to the General Medical Council, in general character advisory to the Minister of Education, but charged in particular with the registration of teachers, the formation of a register of teachers having been strongly urged by the commissioners with a view to the encouragement of professional training; second, as to local authorities, the establishment of local authorities consisting of committees of the county councils with coöpted elements, these local authorities to be entrusted with powers such as the securing of a due provision of secondary instruction; the remodeling when necessary, and supervision of the working of endowed (other than non-local) schools, and other educational endowments; the watchful surveying of the field of secondary education, with the object of bringing proprietary and private schools into the general educational system, and of endeavoring to encourage and facilitate, so far as this can be done by stimulus, by persuasion, and by the offer of privileges and advice, any improvements they may be inclined to introduce; and the administration of such sums, either arising from rates within its area, or paid over by the national exchequer, as may be at its disposal for the promotion of education.

These administrative measures recommended by the Secondary Education Commission in 1895 were to be realized in the course of the next seven years. In the meantime an unsuccessful endeavor was made by Sir John Gorst on behalf of the Conservative government to pass in 1896 an act putting education in the hands of the town councils, and the county councils which had been created by the Local Government Act of 1888; but in 1897, by the passage of the Voluntary Schools Act, further financial aid came to the voluntary schools. In 1899, however, partial effect was given to the Bryce recommendations by the act of that year, to which reference has already been made, creating the Board of Education, but it was not until 1902 that an act was passed creating a local education

authority for every area in England and Wales, and putting an end to the school boards, or *ad hoc* educational authorities as they are often called. And following the passing of the Act of 1902, the administrative reorganization[1] of the Education Office was completed, by which the Board became the central authority for elementary, secondary, and technological instruction.

In the light of the past history of English education legislation the Act of 1902, extended to London in 1903, was a remarkable measure. It embodied Mr. Arthur Balfour's belief in local government and local administrators, and, by giving large educational powers to the administrative bodies created by the Act of 1888, established education authorities for the whole country. Moreover, it compelled these authorities to take over all the voluntary schools, and under such stringent arrangements that, with the exception of schools attached to institutions, no voluntary school after a given date could receive any government grants unless taken over by the local authority. It was thus that in 1902 the Balfour bill brought England into line with Scotland, which in 1872 had been given by Mr. Gladstone a universal and compulsory school board system, establishing education authorities in every borough and parish throughout that country, and leaving the boards free to offer denominational teaching at the expense of the ratepayers. But while the Act thus effected a great educational reform, to the credit of the constructive statesmanship of the Conservative party which had availed itself of an ecclesiastical agitation to take an important step forward in the organization of national education, it in several ways offended many who might otherwise have welcomed it. As usual, compromises failed to satisfy and furthered controversy, provoking political and religious strife and strategy. The Act left the appointment and dismissal of teachers and the control of religious instruction to committees of managers, two thirds of whom were to be appointed by the owners of the schools. Furthermore, it failed to deal with the difficult question of areas having only one public elementary school, in most cases a denominational school. It was accordingly assailed on the one hand because it did not give full control to the local

[1] The chief administrative officer of the Board is the permanent secretary, controlling the three distinct branches of elementary, secondary, and subsequently of technical instruction, each under a separate principal assistant secretary. The Act of 1899 did not provide for an advisory education council as recommended by the Bryce Commission, but instead thereof, provision was made in the Act for the establishment of a Consultative Committee, with more restricted powers; the Consultative Committee was immediately charged in particular with the framing of regulations for a register of teachers to be "formed and kept in a manner to be provided by Order in Council"; the keeping of the register, thus begun, was discontinued in 1908, but was restored in 1912.

authority, and on the other because in many cases Nonconformists would be excluded from teaching positions in the voluntary or non-provided schools, and in many areas[1] their children could receive no religious instruction at school, except such as was given by the denominational teachers. Prolonged agitation against the Act was maintained by these opponents. In particular many Nonconformists declined as a protest to pay part of the education rate, and this hostility found public expression in what came to be known as the "Passive Resistance" movement, which resulted in the Local Authority Default Act of 1904, empowering the Board of Education, in case of default by the local authority, to make payment direct to the managers of the school and to deduct the amount from the sums payable to the defaulting authority on account of parliamentary grants. Now the Conservative government was nearing the end of its long tenure of power, and in the persistent antagonism of the Nonconformists to the Act of 1902 the Liberals saw assistance towards overthrowing their opponents at the next general election. Accordingly the new Liberal platform contained an education plank briefly summarized as popular control of all schools, no religious tests for teachers, and no payment for denominational religious education either from rates or taxes, and pledging the Liberals, if returned to power, to reward their supporters by legislation which would embody all three of these principles. Following the general election in January, 1906, the Liberals were returned by an enormous majority, though in the campaign the education question had been overshadowed by those of tariff reform and Chinese labor.

The Liberals with considerable promptness undertook to redeem their campaign pledges, but without success in Parliament. The religious difficulty[2] was the rock on which three or four education bills were in the

[1] The so-called problem of the single school areas, round which most of the controversy centred, was one of much more complication than might appear on the surface, for there were many country parishes and some urban centres where the only elementary school conveniently situated belonged to the Church of England or other religious body. In these schools the head teachers were always members of the church, Anglican, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or Nonconformist, which owned the school, and the religious instruction was in accordance with its doctrine and discipline. On the other hand, in many great urban centres the only elementary schools available were under the control of the local education authorities, and in these schools no denominational teaching was allowed. Now in the several cases mentioned the children had no alternative but to attend the respective schools, and accordingly they either received religious instruction of a form gravely unsatisfactory to their parents, or, availing themselves of the conscience clause, received what was practically a secular education. See J. Thompson, "Forty-four Years of the Education Question, 1870–1914," London, Sherratt and Hughes, 1914.

[2] Under the New South Wales solution of the religious education problem, instituted in 1881, and later substituted for secular state education in Western

course of as many years one after the other wrecked. Three Liberal Presidents of the Board of Education in turn failed in attempts to repeal the provisions of the Act of 1902 for the denominational control of religious instruction. There was first the Bill of 1906, introduced by Mr. Birrell, framed to sound the death-knell of the voluntary system and secure the full public control of all elementary schools, with the appointment of teachers without reference to religious beliefs. Under its provisions religious instruction in accordance with the school trust deed could be given only out of school hours and not by the regular teachers, though in populous districts, upon the demand of a sufficient number of parents, special facilities for denominational teaching might be included in the school programme. The Birrell bill was killed by public opinion, though its death was ostensibly due to amendments introduced by the House of Lords, which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's government declined to accept. The government, however, was not slow in making a second attempt, and Mr. McKenna, who succeeded Mr. Birrell in 1907, promptly introduced his bill of that year. Though he had avowed that his measure should be not an olive branch but a sword, Mr. McKenna made at least one effort at compromise and settlement with the passive resisters by proposing that the managers of denominational schools should be liable for one-fifteenth of the teachers' salary, this amount representing payment for that portion of the teachers' time which was devoted to denominational instruction. The bill, born dead, was speedily dropped. Nor was Mr. McKenna more fortunate with his bill of 1908, which in fact failed to reach the committee stage. The latter bill undertook frankly to confiscate denominational schools in single school areas, while those of other areas on transfer to the local authority were to forfeit their special character. As an alternative, they might, at the discretion of the Minister of Education, be allowed to contract out, that is, to forego the support of the rates, and instead to receive state aid on the basis of a capitation grant. This proposed return to the discredited dual system ruined whatever prospects the bill may have had. Its author was shortly replaced at the Education Office by Mr. Runciman, who was equally bent on wiping out the Education Act of 1902. The bill introduced in 1908 by Mr. Runciman followed its immediate predecessors in providing for

Australia, Tasmania, and Queensland, there are no religious tests for the teachers. All children whose parents do not desire a different arrangement, receive simple uncontroversial instruction upon selected lessons from the Old and New Testaments. All denominations have equal privileges, which they can use or not at their discretion, of giving at their own expense, and during school hours, definite dogmatic instruction in their own respective doctrines. All children whose parents do not desire them to receive either general or special religious instruction, are taught some secular lesson during the time set apart for the religious instruction of the others.

the transfer of voluntary schools to the local education authority. It allowed contracting out. Schools with few exceptions were to be under the sole charge of the local authority, but denominational teaching was to be permitted on two days of the week, from 9 o'clock to 9:45 A. M. In the preparation of the Runciman bill the government had taken into consultation the leaders of the Church as well as the leaders of Nonconformity, though the Roman Catholics were not assenting parties to the negotiations. Regret was expressed on both sides that these negotiations failed to secure a satisfactory solution, but though unsuccessful the bill served one great advantage by making it clear that responsible leaders in the controversy were willing to make concessions to one another in the interests of a permanent settlement. And this readiness was indicative of a new spirit in the discussion of the religious education question. Mr. Pease[1] succeeded Mr. Runciman as Minister of Education in October, 1911, accepting the Cabinet portfolio, it was reported, with the proviso that he should not be expected to bring in an education bill in 1912.[2] However, in 1913 he introduced a measure of comparatively minor importance not directly affecting religious instruction, but early in its history this bill also was dropped. Then came the Great War. In the Coalition Ministry of 1915, Mr. Pease, as President of the Board of Education, was succeeded by Mr. Arthur Henderson, when for the first time in English history a member of the Labor party was called to share in Cabinet councils. In August, 1916, Mr. Henderson was followed at the Education Office by the Marquis of Crewe, who in turn gave place to Dr. Fisher in December of that year.

Sketching in somewhat rough outlines the historical background of Mr. Fisher's bill, the preceding paragraphs of these notes have presented a rather hurried review of some of the more important stages in the extension of state aid to elementary education, to secondary education, to technical education, and to university education. Any account of the last stages in advance of the Fisher measure should remark that while the decade 1906–16[3] witnessed the enactment of no comprehensive general

[1] An anonymous friend of non-provided schools epitomized these several efforts as follows: Birrell proposed, in Bill of his, suppression, with facilities; McKenna, in his futile Bill, made no pretence to gild the pill; then Runciman, a sanguine gent, designed a "balanced settlement"; and now we pray, though ill at ease, that war may not be made by Pease.

[2] A bill introduced by Sir George Croydon Marks, seeking to suppress denominational schools in single school areas, passed its second reading on the 8th of March, 1912, was referred to a standing committee, and later abandoned.

[3] During these ten years a remarkable movement, the Workers' Educational Association, for the education of adult citizens, has sprung up in England, extended its branches throughout the empire, and attracted widespread attention in Europe and America. Started on the initiative of Mr.

education legislation, it records legislative provision for several new departures in English public education. Certain of these developments are concerned chiefly with the health, leisure and subsistence of school children. The Employment of Children Act of 1904 had forbidden the employment between 9 P. M. and 6 A. M. of any child of school age, the employment of any child in work likely to be injurious to his health or education, and of children under eleven in street trading.[1] For the enforcement of these and similar laws, the period shows a general movement towards placing the whole care of children under the educational rather than the police or other authorities. By the passage of the Education Provision of Meals Act of 1906, local education authorities in England and Wales were empowered to provide for the feeding of necessitous children and to coöperate for this purpose with any voluntary agencies already in existence. More liberal provisions of this sort made in Scotland in 1908, were, immediately after the War broke out in August, 1914, extended by Parliament to England, Wales and Ireland. In 1907 an uncontroversial act entitled the Education Administrative Provisions Act allowed local education authorities to establish vacation schools[2] during the holidays or at any other time, and to give assistance to voluntary committees organized for such purpose. The same act made medical inspection of school children compulsory in England and Wales, and gave the local education authorities power to provide medical treatment. The report of this branch of the service for the year 1915 reveals

Albert Mansbridge, by a group of trade unionists and coöperators, the movement assumed shape in a national conference of workers and scholars held at Oxford, 1903, and some three years later assumed its present name. The W. E. A., as it is now familiarly called, is democratically governed, without political or religious affiliation of any kind. In coöperating with the movement the University of Oxford took the lead in 1907, and in 1908 the association's first university tutorial classes were established at Rochdale and the Potteries. For the organization and supervision of such university tutorial classes every university in England has at present state-aided joint committees consisting of an equal number of university and working-class representatives. See "Oxford and Working-Class Education," Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908; Albert Mansbridge, "University Tutorial Classes," London, Longmans, 1913; Alfred E. Zimmern, "Nationality and Government," New York, McBride, 1918; and for a conservative view of this movement, written by a Canadian publicist, see Andrew Macphail, "Essays in Fallacy," London, Longmans, 1910.

[1] For the further safeguarding of young people who are early forced into industries the act of November 28, 1910, authorized the education authorities to give assistance to boys and girls under seventeen years of age in securing employment.

[2] The first vacation school in England was opened in London in 1902 at the Passmore Edwards Settlement, Tavistock Place. The credit of its initiation is due to Mrs. Humphry Ward, and the money for its support was subscribed by friends. See Alexander Morgan, "Education and Social Progress," London, Longmans, 1916.

startling figures. It appears that of the six million state school children, over one million are too defective or diseased in body or mind to reap reasonable benefit from the educational facilities open to them, two million have defective sight, four million have defective teeth, half a million suffer from malnutrition, a quarter million are seriously crippled or disabled, and more than a quarter million are verminous. Under the present system each child is inspected at three points of school life, but with the machinery so far developed, only two million can be dealt with each year, and where treatment is required only half the work can be done. Despite the magnitude of its task and the present inadequacy of the organization of this department, the chief medical officer of the Board of Education, Sir George Newman, believes that "to secure for all children from infancy an adequate upbringing based on a sufficiency of food, air and exercise is a problem well within compass, not involving either large expenditure or revolutionary methods."[1] Whether or not so sanguine an expectation may be entertained, the value of the school medical inspection and treatment can hardly be overestimated. The comparative statistics embodied in the annual medical reports are invaluable, though war conditions have rendered their interpretation difficult. For example, it appears that the percentage of strong and healthy children in London actually decreased by nearly ten between 1912 and 1914, while in 1915 the percentage rose by about three points, and this improvement held approximately in 1916, though it was not maintained in the following year. The work and revelations of this department have also led to more recent parliamentary provision for the training of defective and epileptic children for which acts were passed in 1913 and in 1914, supplementing those of 1899 and 1906. And in July, 1914, the Board of Education agreed to recognize schools for mothers as part of the educational equipment of the country and to pay to the managers of such schools grants up to fifty per cent. of their approved expenditure.

Free medical attention and free feeding were inevitable paternalistic accompaniments of free education under a universal compulsory system of public elementary education. "It is a platitude, I know," said Mr. Pease when about to leave his post after a longer tenure of it than any of his predecessors at the Board of Education, "when I say that it is a waste of effort to try to educate children who are not physically fit. Our great object is to get children to the schools in a healthy condition." Accordingly during his administration great importance was laid on the medical and physical side of education. The three years of that adminis-

[1] See an illuminating series of articles on "The Education Question," contributed by the Master of Balliol to the *English Review* for May, June, and July, 1917.

tration prior to the war were occupied in preparing proposals for a government bill which it had been intended to press through Parliament in the autumn of 1914, but the outbreak of the war prevented the government from then proceeding further with the measure. Mr. Pease has more lately insisted[1] that any such measure would have to deal with the four great problems of the continuity of education, the improvement[2] of the teachers' positions, the physical condition of the children, and the organization of scholarships. In a review of the work of his department during the War made in the House of Commons in May, 1915, he proposed, among his last official acts, the appointment of an advisory council on industrial research. Shortly after Mr. Arthur Henderson became Minister of Education, action to this effect was taken in July, 1915, and on a broader basis than was contemplated in Mr. Pease's original recommendation. The new department of scientific and industrial research is under the control of a special committee of the Privy Council, whose original non-ministerial members included Mr. Pease, Mr. Arthur Acland, at one time chief of the education department, and Lord Haldane, who for years has thundered on the importance of national education to national industry. The whole scheme, however, is directed by a small advisory council, with Sir William McCormick as chairman, and composed mainly of eminent scientific men and men actually engaged in industrial enterprises dependent upon scientific research.

When Mr. Henderson came to the Education Office there stood to his credit the act for the feeding of necessitous children which had been promoted by the Labor party in 1906. The interests of Labor in the national crisis soon demanded all his energies, but before he resigned the presidency of the Board of Education to become Labor Adviser to His Majesty's Government, several war policies of the department had already been clearly determined. On presenting his estimates for educational expenditure during the year 1916–17 Mr. Henderson said that the educational system of the country had stood the stress and strain of the war satisfactorily.[3] The estimated educational expenditure for 1916–17 was £15,186,732. This sum was less by £294,646 than the sum provided

[1] See "A National System of Education for England and Wales," by Lord Gamford (the Right Hon. Joseph A. Pease), in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1917.

[2] To this end the National Union of Teachers, "the trade union, so to speak, of the teachers," has been systematically working since the days of its foundation in 1870.

[3] In Mr. Henderson's speech referred to above, the judgment of a distinguished officer is quoted to the effect that if it had not been for the discipline of the elementary school, it would not have been possible to have raised and trained the new armies of England, and that thirty years ago a thing of the kind would have been impossible.

by the preceding year's estimates, but it was no less than the expenditure for that year.[1] He felt that all possible retrenchments had been made, but that any question of educational maintenance or of educational reform was in fact a question of national finance. It was always a question of money, more money, and still more money. Moreover, Mr. Henderson expressed the belief that the war had been assisting in the creation of a greater body of public opinion in favor of a more liberal expenditure on education, and that the essential importance of a comprehensive and efficient system of education on the progressive development of national life and the solidifying of the empire had come to be more universally recognized. This principle, he said, the nation should on no account, not even because of its increased expenditure on the war, be deterred from bringing into action. Such action had to be encouraged and fostered as an act of sheer gratitude, if for no other reason, to the men who had fought, suffered and died for their country. In alluding to plans already made by the government, Mr. Henderson stated that for the general work of education reorganization, in addition to an educational reviewing committee, which would itself be a subcommittee of the Prime Minister's Reconstruction Committee, three other non-Cabinet committees of experts would investigate several subjects fundamental to any scheme of reorganization. The first of these, under the presidency of Mr. Herbert Lewis, parliamentary secretary of the Board, would investigate the whole problem of the education of young persons after the war, with special regard to those who had been abnormally employed. The two other committees, under the chairmanship of Professor Sir J. J. Thomson and Mr. Stanley Leathes, would inquire, respectively, into the position of science on the one hand and modern languages on the other in the future development of public education. The instructions to these two committees are significant. They perhaps point to a new scale of values in the subjects of English secondary and university education. In both cases the inquiry is to be concerned with "the requirements of a liberal education"; as a part thereof the Modern Languages Committee is to consider "the history, literature, and civilization of other countries" with special reference to the interests of commerce and the public service, while "the interests of the trades, industries, and professions which particularly depend upon applied science" are to be considered by the Science Committee as well as "the advancement of pure science in the secondary

[1] In 1911–12 the actual expenditure of the Department of Education was £14,302,859; in 1912–13, £14,332,018; in 1913–14, £14,368,794; in 1914–15, £15,096,235—the large increase between these two years being caused by special grants to necessitous areas; and in 1915–16 the total expenditure had grown to £15,174,300.

schools and universities." The reports[1] of these several special committees on juvenile education, science, and modern languages were to be considered by the Reviewing Committee and by that body coördinated into recommendations as a basis for legislation. The Reviewing Committee was initially fortunate in having as its chairman Lord Crewe, who had advocated just such a committee programme in the memorable debates in the House of Lords in July, 1916, on the training and future welfare of the nation. Nor was it a less fortunate circumstance that Lord Crewe was simultaneously President of the Board of Education, though his tenure of that office was too short for the realization of this committee programme, and his administration accordingly proved to be one of transition to the period of progress reserved for his successor.

And it was to be a period of progress. Mr. Fisher's predecessors had prepared the way. Public spirit had been informing public opinion and public opinion had been expressing the public mind. Just before the war a great wave of enthusiasm for education had been sweeping the country. The war raised that wave into a waterspout. The *Times* thundered. The air was electric with educational reform. The National Union of Teachers, for elementary education, the Assistant Masters Association, representing secondary education, the Workers' Educational Association, in the interests of labor, and a score of other organizations had been flashing in quick succession one proposal after another. From all points of the compass the clamor rose, and from all conditions of men. In the confusion of sounds, there were some half dozen clear undertones common to all. These the new minister caught and counterpointed into a constructive programme. New in politics, he proved to be an astute politician. Another historian on the stump, his success was comparable with Woodrow Wilson's. New in Parliament, he soon was recognized as an expert parliamentarian. His maiden speech was made in introducing the Education Estimates[2] in the House of Commons on April 19th, 1917, on the seventieth anniversary to a day of another great educational speech, that of Macaulay in 1847 when state grants were extended from school buildings to education itself. This speech foreshadowed the great measure, already forecast in the public prints, which Mr. Fisher introduced on August 10th, 1917, in a seventy-five minute

[1] The Lewis Report, Cd. 8512, appeared in the spring of 1917; the Thomson Report, Cd. 9011, and the Leathes Report, Cd. 9036, were published a year later.

[2] The estimated expenditure for normal upkeep in 1917–18 was £15,159,780, being less by £26,952 than the amount voted by Parliament in the year 1916–17. But Mr. Fisher asked for a supplementary appropriation of nearly four million pounds, four million less the last-named sum above, and got it, chiefly for salaries and secondary education.

discourse characterized by the *Times* report as a "clear and arresting statement, with hardly a superfluous word," and by Mr. Acland, from the Front Opposition Bench, as marking "the greatest advance in the education of the people since 1870" and recording "a splendid step forward in the national awakening, recalling Milton's words of two hundred and seventy years before, 'the reforming of education is one of the greatest and noblest designs that can be thought on, for the want whereof the nation perishes.'"

The specific proposals of Mr. Fisher's measure were formulated under six heads. We desire to improve the administrative organization of education. We are anxious to secure that every boy and girl of elementary school life up to the age of fourteen shall be unimpeded by the claims of industry. We desire to establish part-time day continuation schools, which every young person shall be compelled to attend, unless he or she is undergoing some suitable form of alternative instruction. We make a series of proposals for the development of the higher forms of elementary education and for the improvement of the physical condition of the children under instruction. We desire to consolidate the elementary school grants. We wish to make an effective survey of the whole educational provision of the country, and to bring private educational institutions into closer and more convenient relations to the national system.

Elaborating this sixfold programme in detail, Mr. Fisher said (and I am continuing to quote and paraphrase from the *London Times Educational Supplement* for August 16th, 1917) that the bill proposed to adhere to the administrative structure erected under the Act of 1902. Moreover, while the new measure touched education at many points, enlarging and enriching opportunities of education for the children of the poor, it did not affect the government of the universities, or of those institutions of secondary, technical, and other forms of higher education which are not maintained or aided by local education authorities. Nor could the bill deal with training colleges, libraries, or the scholarship and pension systems. On the other hand, for the improvement of the existing fabric of elementary education the bill proposed to encourage the establishment of nursery schools for children under five; to amend the law of school attendance so as to abolish all exemptions between the ages of five and fourteen, involving the abolition of the half-time system flourishing in parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire; and to place further restrictions on the employment of children during the elementary school period, in particular forbidding the employment for profit of any child under twelve. The most novel, if not the most important, provision in the bill proposed that, with certain exceptions, every young person no longer under any obligation to attend a public elementary school should attend a continua-

tion school for a period of three hundred and twenty hours in the year, or the equivalent of eight hours a week for forty weeks. Every young person who had not received a full-time education up to the age of sixteen, was to receive a part-time education up to eighteen either in schools provided by the local education authority or in schools under their direction, such as those established by manufacturers in their works. Furthermore, the bill provided that such part-time instruction must be by day, must be taken out of the employer's time, nor might any young person be worked unduly long hours during the days on which the continuation classes were held. In this connection and others the bill would offer many opportunities for better physical education and social training by giving physical training a place in the continuation schools; by empowering the local education authority to establish nursery schools and to maintain playing fields, school baths, game centres, and equipment for physical training; and by extending the powers with respect to medical inspection already possessed by the education authorities. Finally Mr. Fisher discussed in particular three of the bill's administrative provisions, namely, those relating to the inspection of public and private schools, to the collection of educational information, and to the consolidation of all grants for elementary education.

In Parliament the more purely educational provisions of the measure were cordially received, but the administrative clauses encountered considerable opposition, which became so formidable that the bill was, in December, 1917, allowed to lapse with the understanding that a revised form would be introduced later. The opposition was mainly due, as has been intimated earlier in these notes, to the possible interpretation of certain of the administrative provisions as establishing bureaucratic control under central authority, thus imperilling the freedom and autonomy of the local authorities, and to this English educational tradition had been long opposed. From another direction fears had also been expressed that "one of the effects of the original bill might be to prejudice the position of the voluntary schools and the religious education in those schools." In the revised form introduced on January 14th, 1918, Mr. Fisher had met most of these objections, as may be inferred on reading his short introductory speech, reproduced in part in a later section of this article, in which he indicated either the omission of offending clauses or suggested satisfactory substitutions therefor. As might have been expected, the proposed changes in the revised bill were concerned primarily with administrative measures. So far successfully steered by the wisdom and tact of a stout-hearted pilot, the bill on its new course was shortly to be threatened by serious disturbance from an old storm centre, already well charted by wrecks of educational measures, for a group of child labor

employers, led by the Federation of British Industries, induced in a "small but powerful body of reactionaries in the House of Commons" determined opposition to the proposed compulsory continuation education. However, inasmuch as sufficient teachers were not immediately available to man the new continuation schools, Mr. Fisher was in position to modify his course without abandoning its guiding principle. And thus, after political adventures against some adverse currents, in almost exactly a twelvemonth the Fisher bill realized the *bon voyage* waved by Lord Crewe on its first days out, "It must be the hope of all friends of education that the measure may enjoy fair winds during its passage through Parliament, and that it may be signalled into port before many months have gone by."

II

FINAL FORM OF THE ACT AS SIGNED ON AUGUST 8, 1918

An Act to make further provision with respect to Education in England and Wales and for purposes connected therewith.

BE it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in the present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

1.—With a view to the establishment of a national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby, it shall be the duty of the council of every county and county borough, so far as their powers extend, to contribute thereto by providing for the progressive development and comprehensive organization of education in respect of their area, and with that object[1*] any such council from time to time may, and shall when required by the Board of Education, submit to the Board schemes showing the mode in which their duties and powers under the Education Acts are to be performed and exercised, whether separately or in coöperation with other authorities.

2.—(1)[1] It shall be the duty of a local education authority[2] so to exercise their powers under Part III. of the Education Act, 1902, as[3]—

(*a*) to make, or otherwise to secure,[4] adequate and suitable provision by means of central schools, central or special classes, or otherwise—

[1*] While reproducing here the official text of the final form of the bill as printed in the London *Times*, it has seemed desirable to provide for comparative readings of the final form with the two earlier forms of the bill. Space, however, is not available for reprinting *in toto* each of the three forms, nor is this size of page practicable for parallel columns of variations; accordingly an effort has been made to furnish the means of reconstructing the earlier forms out of the final form by inserting indices 1, 2, 3, . . . at points in the final form where variations occur in one or both of the earlier forms; and in order to do the least possible violence to the running text of the final bill, these variations are assembled, in the section immediately following this reprint, in a series of numbered paragraphs bearing, respectively, the numbers of the several paragraphs of the final form of the bill.